THEOLOGY

VOL. XLVII AUGUST, 1944 No. 290

Editorial Notes

WHEN Christian men and women return from the wars, and are considering how and where they are going to live and work, the call to service in the Church overseas ought to be presented to them as clearly as possible. *Man Power in the Twentieth Century Church*, by Canon J. McLeod Campbell (Missionary Council of the Church Assembly, 2s. 6d.), contains a concise statement of the need that there will be for priests, doctors and teachers in the various provinces of the Anglican communion. For several years scarcely any new recruits have been able to join the already overworked staffs of the younger Churches. It is true that in many countries, notably in India and China, the time has come when the leadership of the Church must no longer depend on missionaries from Europe; but this is very far from saying that the indigenous Churches have no further need of help from the Church at home. The need is as great as ever, but it will have to take a different form in the coming period. "The twentieth century is not the nineteenth. What was legitimate and praiseworthy in the nineteenth-century missionary is not equally becoming in the twentieth-century missionary, who must make fundamental adjustments of outlook; if, as is likely, he is still accorded the same title, he will have to live down some of its associations."

There is going to be a very serious problem of man-power in the Church at home, especially as regards priests and teachers. But it is impossible to contemplate the condition of the Church overseas without being convinced that the need there will be greater still. Ought not the Church at home to make much fuller use of the ministry of laymen so as to release a larger number of priests for the hard-pressed dioceses abroad? In this, as in other respects, does not the Church abroad put the Church at home to shame? For example, the Bishop of Guiana, who has twenty-seven priests in his diocese, writes as follows in the May number of *El-Dorado*:

> Somebody wrote to me the other day from England to ask how we manage with our small staff of clergy to serve so many people in so great an area as British Guiana. One might well wonder, for there are 110 churches in the diocese—to say nothing of hospitals and public institutions—to be looked after and provided with proper ministrations. By the grace of God the clergy themselves often "achieve the impossible"; but they would be the first to give credit to our catechists and lay-readers. A few of these lay-workers are paid, but the majority give voluntary service to the Church. A fine body of men they are—and we certainly could not carry on without them. Some of those who hold a licence not only conduct various Sunday services and preach, but are ready at any time—in the unavoidable absence of the priests—to take funerals or to be responsible for Baptism and Confirmation classes.

* * * *

In connexion with the article that follows on the forms of public worship, attention may be called to three letters which were written to his son by the late Dr N. P. Williams, and which have now been published as a booklet, entitled *Sunday Morning—Which Service?* (S.P.C.K., 6d.). They provide a remarkably clear summary of the development of Christian worship and an explanation of the way in which Mattins came to be regarded in the last century as the chief Sunday service. They will prove useful to all who are concerned to restore the Eucharist to its proper place.

Beauty for Ashes, or The 1949 Prayer Book

If there is one word that friend and foe agree in applying to the Church of England, it is the overdriven epithet "comprehensive." It is necessary therefore to point out that, on the contrary, at least so far as concerns public worship, a less "comprehensive" Church has never existed in all Christendom, whether inside or outside of the Catholic tradition. Outside of that tradition, the congregations of Nonconformity are permitted the widest latitude in their devotions; inside it, the Orthodox and the Roman Churches alike make separate provision for the needs of a spiritual adept and a beginner. *Ecclesia Anglicana* stands alone in her insistence on a single standard of prayer, and requires conformity to it from all her members, in whatever stage of spiritual development they may be. It is important that this peculiarity should be appreciated, for it is really the spectre that haunts much of our controversy and indiscipline. Mattins and Evensong are the only authorized moulds into which an Englishman's extra-eucharistic piety may pour itself. We are committed, alone among Christians, to the principle of devotional uniformity; and it is high time that the validity of this principle should be re-examined.

The First English Prayer Book was an experiment of Cranmer's which offered to lay people two new privileges: hearing the Mass in their own tongue, and also sharing in the recitation of the Divine Office. Nowadays such interest as the Book commands is usually centred upon its version of the Eucharist, but it is nevertheless questionable whether the popularization of the choir offices was not really the more important and far-reaching innovation of the two. To throw open to all and sundry the technicalities of the world's most highly professionalized system of worship was a more remarkable piece of hardihood than the simple Englishing of Christianity's best-known service. For nothing quite like the Divine Office has ever been evolved by mankind. It was built up by a vast international corporation, existing continuously over hundreds of years and composed of skilled craftsmen deeply in love with their work. As the centuries went by, a slow succession of experts, each in his generation, had gradually clothed the recitation of the Psalter with touch after touch of inspired artistry: here an office hymn, there a decorative responsory, elsewhere a set of mystically significant antiphons—all to be judged and used by fellow-craftsmen as devoted as themselves, and so only winning acceptance

at the price of intrinsic excellence. Patiently and slowly, by the labours of many lifetimes, a structure of elaborate beauty and immense intricacy was wrought into shape; a smoothly revolving rhythm of many movements, geared with exactitude to the rotating cylinder of the Church's year. Only professionals worshipping with absorbed devotion could have constructed it; only their fellow-professionals could appreciate or even comprehend its complex genius.

When such a masterpiece as this exists, it is an understandable enthusiasm that believes it to be the best vehicle for Everyman's prayers. But the inherent dilemma ought to have been evident. It is the problem of arranging a Beethoven sonata for the nursery piano: if it is not simplified beyond recognition the tyro cannot play it, and if it is the adept will not. The two degrees of proficiency are incompatible, but Cranmer did not see it. Characteristically, he tried to compromise and build a *via media* in which professional and amateur could walk together, even if they were not agreed. In the interests of the one he retained the ground-plan of the ancient Hours; for the sake of the other he stripped them of their prismatic day-to-day colouring and reduced them to a tramping course of psalmody and Bible-reading which marched heavily forward from the first day of the year to the last. The Scylla of complexity had been evaded; but the Charybdis of monotony was to wreck the ship. For the very essence of the *opus Dei* is that it must be an unresting cycle of continuous praise, which requires a constant attendance upon its daily rotations; and consequently, should anything discourage the laity from rendering this punctual attendance, then the whole rationale of this particular form of systematized worship would be stultified. This is precisely what has happened; for the offices have been made so uninvitingly drab that the prospect of their daily repetition repels more laymen than it allures.

As it happens, extraneous circumstances have largely obscured this dilemma until now. Up to the present century the social obligation of Sunday churchgoing has proved strong enough to divert critical attention from the forms of worship provided. Only in our own day has the decay of this convention cleared the field for a dispassionate judgment upon Cranmer's experiment. He believed that the masses would welcome the opportunity of expressing their religion in liturgical patterns. To-day, after four hundred years, the masses for the first time are free to give their answer. It takes the form of an immediate and widespread revulsion from his compilations; of a general curtailment and mutilation of the objective and liturgical portions of Morning and Evening Prayer, and a concentration of interest upon the subjective and non-liturgical portions which follow the Third Collect. Among parish priests it is common knowledge that the more closely a service can be made to approximate to the nonconformist style of worship, the more acceptable it is to the laity. On this point the character of the services provided by the B.B.C. and the Army is significant: both these two *ex-officio* interpreters of the common man's religion agree in their mutilation of Prayer Book forms of worship.

Nobody with parochial experience is likely to deny all this. But there is another side to the equation; for in the same breath it must

also be insisted that there is still, and there always will be, a devout minority to whom the Divine Office is the supreme utterance of the human heart and the very perfection of earthly praise. They know it for "the stateliest measure ever moulded by the lips of man," and precisely on this account their attitude to Cranmer's emasculated version of it is as impatient as that of the masses, though for directly opposite reasons. For them the Procrustean bed of the Prayer Book is as much too short as it is too long for the majority, and so we find in both parties an equal unwillingness to be either squeezed or stretched upon it. Nevertheless, the Tudor rule of uniformity requires them to lie together, uneasy bedfellows in a partnership of discomfort.[1] Discontent with this emboldened some of the nineteenth-century ritualists to put in a claim for the complete restoration of the Church's liturgical heritage; but in the hands of their successors the campaign they launched came to concern itself with little else but eucharistic worship. The consequent recovery in that field has been substantial; it is perhaps not too much to say that if a medieval ecclesiastic were to attend one of our High Masses he would miss little of his accustomed ritual and ceremonial. But on this very account his bewilderment in the complementary sphere of the Divine Office would only be the greater. In his day, and up to the sixteenth century, the Jachin and Boaz of the Christian temple had always been the Mass and the choir offices; and it was the second that actually bulked larger in the religious scene than the first. The celebration of Mass may have been a priest's highest privilege, but the recitation of the Hours was at all times his prior obligation. So we must reckon it among the strangest features of the modern "Catholic" revival that so much diligence has been expended in restoring the dignity and importance of the altar services, while the no less venerable services of the choir have been almost contemptuously ignored, and even deliberately belittled. There are churches where High Mass is celebrated with the utmost magnificence, and the preparatory choir office suppressed altogether—and that although the liturgical connexion between them is so close that a hebdomadary priest at Sarum was expressly prohibited from celebrating the conventual Mass unless he had previously officiated at the singing of Mattins.

Nevertheless, the experience gained in the development of eucharistic devotion may help us with the parallel problem of the offices. In the last century, as soon as more frequent celebrations of the Mass began to make their appearance, the first difficulty to be felt was the monotony of the Prayer Book Order. The weight of daily repetition threw too big a load on its over-simple structure; the burden of it was intolerable. "Every prayerful individual," as Frere observed, "is conscious of the deadening power of unchanging use." Consciously or unconsciously, what was desiderated was the lost Propers; the introits, grails and communions that provide the needful touch of differential colouring

[1] There are, of course, a good few churchpeople of the older generation who belong to neither of these categories. They "like" the Prayer Book services for good or bad reasons of conservatism, and are upset if these are mangled. The 1949 Book has not forgotten them.

etween one celebration and another. Many priests who formed the abit of supplementing the Prayer Book Ordinary—whether privately r otherwise—with these minor variables found that it enabled them o use the Anglican rite without any dissatisfaction and without ecourse to unauthorized service-books. This, then, seems to point the vay to a similar method of dealing with the choir offices. In both cases he difficulty is identical—namely, that the bare Ordinary deprived of ts Proper is found too jejune for human nature's daily food. Since, herefore, the restoration of the Proper went so far to allay discontent t the altar, is it unreasonable to deduce that it would be equally velcome in the choir? As things are, the liturgically minded religious s virtually obliged to have recourse to the Roman Breviary, and this annot be reckoned to him for gain. It leads almost inevitably to neglect f the Prayer Book, with the result that his devotional life comes in the nd to be nourished on the Breviary—and the mind of the Breviary, hen all is said and done, is not the mind of his own Church. The nes on which a certain church near the south coast is already experienenting seems to be more satisfactory. There Morning and Evening 'rayer are said every day, and not a word of the Prayer Book rite is mitted. But the offices are treated as though they were so many accumulated" Hours, each of which is accorded its due Proper from ne ancient English use. Thus at Morning Prayer the Venite is interoven with its invitatory and followed by the matutinal hymn before ne psalms; and the first Lesson (with its traditional benediction before nd after) is answered by a responsory. With the antiphon to the enedicite the ferial office moves out of the sphere of Mattins into that f Lauds, with the second lesson as a *capitulum*. The appropriate auds hymn, with its versicle and response, follows the Lesson, and enedictus is said under the antiphon of the day. The whole results in morning office sufficiently variable and satisfying to preserve its evotional freshness throughout the year, as well as one that brings to ght many of the lost beauties of the ancient Hours. Evensong is milarly resolved into the component Vespers and Compline with their espective Propers. Yet the spirit of these devotions is wholly Anglican, r always behind the enrichments the Prayer Book Order is there in s entirety.

The fact that alongside services of the B.B.C. and Army type an tterly different kind of worship like this is being daily offered to God irely proves the existence of two parallel needs in the Anglican temerament. Is there any reason why they should not be met by the uthorization of a double standard of worship? After all, the rest of atholic Christendom recognizes the two types, and, while excusing the ne from any kind of liturgical Hours whatever, is careful to provide e other with a complete approved Breviary. The remainder of this per is concerned with the suggestion of a similar concession to the eds of English people.

In five years from now we shall have reached the quatercentenary the First English Prayer Book. It is tempting to see in this an propriate opportunity to bring our whole system of public worship

back to a real correspondence with the needs of the faithful, and to align it once more with the traditions and practice of the rest of the Catholic Church. As a foretaste of what might be, let us permit ourselves a glimpse into the future, and, overleaping a decade, imagine that for a moment we hold in our hands a five-year-old copy of the 1949 Prayer Book.

The Order of Holy Communion, we observe, still occupies the central section of the book. On the hither side of it are grouped the occasional offices of Baptism, Catechism and Confirmation, and on the farther side Matrimony, Visitation and Burial. The absence of Mattins and Evensong is immediately noticeable, and suggests a clue to the guiding principle of the whole revision. This is made clear on reference to the rubrics. They tell us that the previous legal status of Mattins is now transferred to the Eucharist, which has thus become the sole form of worship a parish priest need provide in his church on Sunday morning. By this means the service of universal Christian obligation is restored to its rightful supremacy, and the tactical blunder of the Reformers corrected; for it is not the least serious of Cranmer's miscalculations that he opened the door for our modern heresy of making Mattins the only act of devotion on the Lord's Day.

Evensong has also been released from statutory obligation, and in its place the parson may if he prefers substitute some informal or semi-structural service. This admittedly led to a few eccentricities here and there at first; but already another Hawker of Morwenstowe has arisen to devise, out of his own spiritual imaginativeness and his insight into the hearts of his flock, an evening devotion that succeeds in expressing the popular piety of Anglicanism as naturally and felicitously as Benediction does for Romanism. This new service is now the norm on Sunday evenings both in town and country, for unlike the older *opus Dei* it is an indigenous product of Anglo-Saxon soil. Nevertheless, any conservatively minded parish is still at perfect liberty to retain the former Evensong if that should be its preference.

There exists also, however, a companion volume to the 1949 Prayer Book. This is the clergy's office book, and it is made quite clear that the use of its contents in public services for the laity is no longer compulsory. In the first section of this book we find not only the familiar Ordinary of Mattins and Evensong, but the Ordinary of Sext as well; for it is recognized that, with the general public no longer mainly in view, a greater assiduity in prayer may reasonably be required of the clergy—upon whom the duty of midday devotions is traditionally incumbent.[1] The middle portion of the book is occupied by the Psalter, and the last by the Lectionary. The reading of these morning, noon and evening offices is now of obligation for every cleric.

Finally, there is a separate Supplement authorized in the interests of the devout minority. This, for optional use, contains not only an approved Proper of seasons and holydays with the appropriate invitatories, hymns, responsories, antiphons and memorials, but also an

[1] Ps. lv, 17; Dan. vi, 10.

appendix of Third Lections for black-letter days. This appendix rolls away a reproach of long standing. For four centuries now the Church has continued to direct attention to certain saints on certain days, presumably in order to the study and imitation of their merits, yet all this time she has completely stultified her intention by withholding their histories. Just what purposes of edification it was imagined that any kalendar without its complementary martyrology ever would or could serve we shall probably never know; but in fact it has produced exactly the same situation that confronted St Paul in Athens. At a hundred altars to-day there may be witnessed the pious idiocy of a celebration with proper colours and full ritual in honour of a saint about whom nobody in the church knows a thing. Whom therefore they ignorantly commemorate, the 1949 Book now declares in a series of *historiæ sanctorum* which, following Quinones' excellent lead, *nihil habent, ut prius, quod graves et doctas aures offendat.*

In sum, we find that the issue of this Prayer Book has greatly eased the old tension between regular and occasional churchgoers. First, the principles of the Reformers, so disastrously subverted by their own Book, have been vindicated by the rescue of the Eucharist from obscurity and its restoration to the unchallenged dominance of Sunday morning.[1] Secondly, the clerical offices have abdicated a position for which they were neither intended nor fitted, and in their place the evening churchgoer may look forward to a service better suited to his tastes and his needs (unless he should prefer to continue in the old ways). Thirdly, lovers of the historic forms of prayers have been presented with an authentic Anglican Breviary in the room of Cranmer's colourless version—"the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness." For the first time "comprehensiveness" has become a reality instead of a delusion. The twin breasts of Mother Church have been unsealed, and once again, as in former times, a double fountain flows from them for the nourishment of her twofold offspring.

J. H. M. Staniforth.

Flimwell Vicarage,
Hawkhurst, Kent.

The Place of the Cathedrals[2]

In the current stocktaking of the Church's life, the Cathedrals are bound to prove an important item on the balance sheet. The following is a brief attempt to make some reflections on their position from the

[1] To the greater edification of the laity themselves; for though they have never shown much comprehension of the meaning of the liturgical office, that of the Eucharist has proved itself readily understandable when it has been taught. The Holy Communion is the most popular and best attended voluntary service in most Public Schools.

[2] Since this article was written, the Dean of Lichfield has devoted to the subject a University Sermon at Oxford, since published in pamphlet form (F. A. Iremonger, *The Cathedral Foundations*: Humphrey Milford, 6d.). His conclusions as to the value of the Cathedrals are of considerable importance. He makes a vigorous plea for a radical change in appointments to the Chapters if the true functions of the Cathedrals are to be upheld. To the traditional view of the Cathedrals as "Seats of Sacred Learning" and

point of view of the younger clergy. If autobiography may be forgiven, the writer, in the course of eight years in Orders, has been unofficially attached to three Cathedrals, and has been present at many discussions of their place in the life of the Church. He has himself passed from a general dislike to some appreciation of their purpose and value, and to some vision of their future service. Many questions are necessarily left on one side: there are great differences in the Cathedrals—we may mention only the differences between the old and new foundations, the varying traditions, the diversity of appointment to offices, the differences of Statutes, and the double function of certain Cathedrals which are also parish churches. But three questions in particular need to be answered.

I.—The "utilitarian" criticism of the Cathedrals is increasingly heard. The necessity for "setting our house in order," the wise distribution of finance and personnel, is widely discussed. Why, it may be asked, spend so much (£5,000 per annum as a very conservative estimate) for so few results? Why tie up so many men urgently needed in other places? In that criticism there is much that is true. It is not unnatural, nor, indeed, is it wholly undesirable, to wish to "see results"; and the shortage of priests due to the war intensifies the objection to large staffs.

But this criticism may be on either of two grounds. (1) It may be a genuinely spiritual objection that the Cathedrals are simply not pulling their weight in advancing the purposes of God. Or (2) it may spring from the point of view that the service of *men* is the sole justification for the existence of the Church. It is necessary to discriminate between the two. So far as the former objection is concerned, the Cathedrals cannot claim exemption from criticism. Some Chapters are very like small Fascist states; some are so concerned with maintaining the familiar system as to lose sight of the needs of the people and the deeper *raison d'être* of the system itself; some are simply living upon the—admittedly glorious—traditions of the past. Nor can the latter objection be summarily dismissed. There is a dangerous abstraction in thinking and speaking of "the life of the Church" apart from the body of the faithful. Yet it may perhaps be suggested that we have in the Cathedrals a great opportunity for standing out against a merely utilitarian criticism. The existence of such centres of worship, teaching, and devotion has an *objectiveness* which is a necessary part of a healthy Christianity; they stand for the principle that the Church exists first and foremost for God and His glory, that worship must be the primary activity of the Christian life: an objectiveness which is heightened, for example, by the normally small attendance at the full offering of the daily Offices. It is interesting to the present writer that two Chaplains to the Forces recently expressed their views to him—the one demanding that the Cathedrals should come out into the arena of active life, the

"Schools of Sacred Song," he suggests a third function, "Centres of Social Witness." This is a suggestive section, and it deals in part with the third problem raised in this article. Dr Iremonger fails, however, to my mind, sufficiently to recognize that the *first* "specific" function of the Cathedrals is the *opus Dei*, the objective offering of the Church's worship.

other stating that their existence formed a stabilizing and inspiring background to his own workaday ministry.

II.—It is necessary that we should decide upon the principles for which the Cathedrals stand, and that their machinery should, if necessary, be overhauled and adapted to the better fulfilling of those principles. Their chief duty may perhaps be summarized as the highest offering of worship; they are foundations for the greater glory of God. Here, once again, we need to be careful in our statements and to beware of clichés and abstractions. But if the value of "objectiveness," as suggested above, be allowed, then the perfection of Christian worship is their primary task and duty: they stand, indeed, in the tradition of the religious communities—"withdrawn to offer"—an obligation, as the communities themselves show, not necessarily incompatible with public work. They will be an example to the parishes; "the Mother Church" will be more than an empty title. They will reveal to the world the oblation of the Christian life in worship, in self-giving to God.

How far does the present machinery of Cathedral life fit in with this ideal? Many problems are at once raised, not least the vexed question of appointments. There are captious critics who would suggest that drastic overhaul is needed here, who would maintain that rather too often a Deanery is the final honour of a not-quite-eminent life, Canonries a convenient method of paying diocesan officials or a suitable refuge for men of abstruse learning, and Minor Canonries posts for men of good voice somewhat lacking in other qualifications of the ministry. It is not our purpose now to discuss these opinions, but perhaps we may venture to put forward certain constructive suggestions.

(1) As we have seen, it goes without saying that Cathedral worship must be of the highest standard. And, because the Cathedral is the Mother Church of the diocese, that worship must be *fully representative*. It seems to the writer that we are failing in principle if the *whole* liturgical round is not duly performed. The vexed questions of the hours of services, the balancing of the claims of communicating and non-communicating attendance, and the place of the fast before Communion, must of course be taken into account. At the moment he would simply insist upon the need of both Offices and Eucharist being given their due place—which is hardly fulfilled by the common custom of an early "low" Celebration followed in the middle of the morning by Sung Mattins. And if it be objected either that the chief congregation would be split up, or that "people would not come" in any numbers to both services, then, as we have seen, that is a matter of far less importance to a Cathedral than to a parish church; nor can considerations of mere expediency be allowed to override principle, particularly in a matter where the whole reason for the Cathedral's existence is at stake.

(2) The worship must be of the highest standard *in every respect*. All too often a very beautiful act of worship from the musical point of view is marred by comparative slovenliness of dress and ceremonial or by a superabundance of meaningless ceremony. Is it too much to hope

that, just as a musical expert is thought to be a necessary part of the personnel of every Cathedral, so there should be also a liturgical expert, to whose knowledge in his own sphere the whole staff will defer? Probably there is a place for some experiment here; but the primary need is for a thoroughly liturgical ceremonial, simple, traditional, expressive, beautiful, and, above all, objective.

What is true of the ordering of services holds good also for the care of the building. There can be, in a Cathedral, no sort of excuse for clutter, or for tawdry or mass-produced ornament and decoration. Æsthetics must be given serious consideration, and well-meaning donors politely but firmly deterred from making gifts which do not harmonize with the building as a whole. If it be objected that certain furnishings—*e.g.*, the chapels and altars—would not be in very regular use, it is again beside the point, for the Cathedral is seeking an objective standard of offering to God.

(3) We shall be justified in seeking for a high standard of preaching. Dr Farmer has called "the rediscovery of the significance of preaching" one of the central and distinctive trends in contemporary theology. Can we in honesty say that the power of the pulpit is sufficiently used in the Cathedrals? Of course there are difficulties; with the statutory rotation of preachers it is almost impossible to secure regular and systematic instruction. But in view of the pressing need for the steady and solid presentation of all sides of the Christian faith, intellectual, practical, devotional, and hortatory, may we not ask either for a change of machinery in this respect, or, continuing the statutory round, for additional sermons detached from the services? A Chancellor recently found a considerable and willing audience for a course of lectures on Christian doctrine in a Cathedral city; it is not too much to hope that further ventures of this kind may become common.

(4) All that has been said leads sooner or later to the question of the composition of the Chapters, an invidious and dangerous matter to discuss! On the whole, however, it is not unkind nor hopelessly inaccurate to describe the Chapters as frequently consisting of diocesan officials or honoured pensioners. Can we remain satisfied with this state of affairs? Admittedly, a place on a Cathedral Chapter is technically a sinecure; from which many would deduce that it is a suitable position for a man with other diocesan responsibilities; moreover, it is, as we have seen, a ready and convenient way of providing salaries for such officials. But the life of the Cathedral itself should be regarded as of vital importance. Two alternatives may be suggested: (*a*) that the Chapters should consist of a number of recognized "experts," liturgical, theological, devotional, whose first duty is to make the Cathedral the true centre of the diocese; in and through this they may exercise their wider influence on the diocese as a whole. (*b*) A more revolutionary proposal—we should dismiss from our minds the idea that a Cathedral post is one of "honour," a fitting return for services rendered to the Church, and seek the appointment of younger men asked *for a limited period* to serve their diocese and Church in this particular way. The benefit to the Church would be twofold: the freeing of the Cathedrals from a mere honoured conservatism; and

the opportunity given to the younger men, as it were on a "refresher course," to pray and think and work in community. Let it be said once more that the second alternative depends upon abandoning the idea of "reward" in the Canonries, etc.; the Honorary Canons would still be appointed with this end in view, for it is highly appropriate that those who have faithfully or eminently served the Church should be called into the co-operation of the Greater Chapter. It needs, perhaps, to be said that no " age group "—old or young—can claim a monopoly of devotion or ability in the work of the Church. It is possible unthinkingly to take over the present stress on " Youth" as a panacea for all clerical evils; if so, we are doomed to disappointment. But the second alternative might well be tried as a counter-experiment to the well-worn use of "age and experience."

III.—The Cathedrals face in a particularly pointed form a problem which is always before the Church—the relation between a "concentrated" and a "diffused" Christianity,[1] the relation of the convinced Christian to the great number of those "interested," and lightly attached to the life of the Church. Inevitably, a large number of the Cathedral congregation will consist of the second type; the "whole-hogging" Christian will more commonly be found in the parish churches where the Christian community-life is a more obvious reality. Those who are interested in good music; those with an appreciation of great architecture and a love of dignity; those who are intrigued by the Christian faith; those who wish occasionally to take part in worship; those to whom the English Church is a part of a great national heritage—these and many others will congregate at the Cathedrals, which are thus bridges connecting the life of those not very deeply influenced by religion with the Christian community within, links between the "diffused Christianity" of the nation as a whole and the specific Churchmanship of the "inner circle."

And we cannot rest content until the Cathedrals are leading men on to a deeper acceptance of Christianity. How may that be done? Many methods have been suggested: to mention but two, there is the witness of the whole ethos of the Cathedral, the attractive power of an ordered activity directed towards God, the importance of which cannot be over-rated; and there is again the great opportunity of preaching, the manifesting of the distinctively Christian way of belief and of life.

How far, then, are such things as "popular services," and the provision for particular classes of the community—*e.g.*, "Empire Youth Sunday"—desirable? The Bishop of Oxford has recently taken a firm stand against such use of the Cathedrals and parish churches, pointing out that such acts of worship are essentially a denial of the full liturgical family life of the Church. With this standpoint the writer is in full sympathy. Yet it needs to be remembered that we have a duty to the "godfearers," the loosely attached; and therefore there may be some place for liturgical experiment and for services specifically intended for those who do not understand the regular worship of the Church, provided always that it is made plain that such services are

[1] *Cf.* the article on "Diffused Christianity," by John Drewett, THEOLOGY, August, 1942.

only supplementary to the full liturgical round, to which they should be an introduction. At the moment we have rather lost our sense of balance here. On the one hand, there is the regular offering of worship with often but little attempt to point out its importance and meaning. (Is it hypercritical to suggest that a liturgical sense is not automatically a possession of Cathedral dignitaries? The writer has several times been amazed and horrified to discover a total lack of understanding of some of the fundamental principles of worship in those of long standing in Cathedral life.) On the other hand, there is a careless joy in experiment which is satisfied with filling the Cathedrals for "special services" to the exclusion of the true family life of the Church. First things, it is true, should be put first; but that does not necessarily exclude the things of secondary importance.

We have, then, in the Cathedrals a great tradition and a great opportunity waiting to be used. We should think out and use more fully the Cathedral heritage. They cannot have the warm intimacy and associations of the true parish church; but they have much to contribute to the life of the whole Christian community, which they alone can give.

D. R. Hutchinson.

Ripon.

Unitas Episcoporum

If the South India coalescence takes place, it appears that the four dioceses concerned will fall into a separation, temporary as we hope, from the Anglican Communion. It is intended that, despite such separation (not to be called schism), the existing bishops and their successors shall transmit within the new community the Apostolic Succession of Holy Orders "acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing . . . the authority of the whole body." The Episcopalians of South India, it is said, will be individually in communion with the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, though not corporately in organic union. It is suggested that the continuity of the episcopate will by-pass other temporary defects, so that, when the non-episcopal ministers have disappeared, it will be possible to recognize the body as possessing a valid ministry and sacraments. Nevertheless it is doubtful whether the procedure is so designed as to secure the intended transmission against cavil even from those who accept the validity of Anglican Orders.

When Newman in Tract 1, revolting against current Erastianism, claimed for "Our Apostolical Descent" an authority independent of secular support, he did not define his meaning. It has come to be almost universally accepted that the Apostolic Succession means the transmission from one person to another of an indelible character; and that this involves, in the case of a bishop, the power of ordaining to the priesthood, and in the case of a priest the power to celebrate a valid Eucharist. And it is believed that sacramental grace is secured provided that there is an unbroken succession from consecrator to consecrated. Under this theory any bishop will serve our turn, irrespective

of the jurisdiction he may hold. His personal status in Apostolic Succession in this sense is the cause and guarantee of the efficacy of his acts.[1]

There is an example of this conception in Vaux and Littledale's Priest's Prayer Book,[2] where the episcopal pedigree of the Restoration bishops is traced so as to show that they all had succession from either Laud or Williams, at the consecration of both of whom there assisted Marc Antonio de Dominis (formerly Archbishop of Spalato), an episcopus vagans of Italian origin, and two others who partly derived from Irish bishops. It is supposed that, even if the English strand is open to an allegation of loss of continuity, the succession is unquestioned in the Irish and Italian lines. So firm a hold has this theory upon our thought that it appears to be the fundamental requirement of the Lambeth Conference in assessing the propriety of intercommunion with particular Churches. Thus, on the shores of the Baltic, we find that Swedish Orders are strictly correct in this sense: the actual succession of the Swedish Episcopate is unbroken, and therefore all is well between us and them. But the same does not apply to Norwegian and Danish Orders, or to Finnish Orders ("through a combination of accidents"!). And in 1908 we made elaborate proposals for restoring the Apostolic Succession to the Moravians, blindly ignoring the fact that they allow deacons to celebrate Holy Communion and to administer Confirmation.

This theory of the Ministry is usually described as Augustinian. Augustine's argument is that heretics or schismatics should not be rebaptized on reconciliation to the Catholic Church, and that the same applies to ordination (*contra Ep. Parmeniani* ii. 28, sed sicut baptismus in eis, ita ordinatio mansit integra). From this we infer the indelible character conferred by both sacraments. The unworthiness of the minister hindereth not the efficacy of the sacrament, whether he be immoral, heretical or schismatic. And though the unworthiness of the recipient on any of these grounds does, for the time being, preclude the activity of sacramental grace, the virtue of the sacrament is reviviscent (as we should now call it) if and when he repents and is reconciled to the Church.

We may readily agree to the fundamental truth of this position, but yet may feel that it is not the whole truth. It represents a claim to validity apart from regularity. We are accustomed to assert the possibility of validity without regularity, but perhaps we ought to say, rather, efficacy without regularity. For regularity *where it may be had* is surely necessary to validity. We may not despise it, but are in duty bound to maintain it both for ourselves and others.

By contrast with the Augustinian view Cyprian insists upon something which is properly complementary to it—namely, the necessity of the minister's integration in the Church, so that what is done may be done by and on behalf of the Church.[3] Thus he writes, "the episcopate is one, each part of which is held by each bishop in solidarity."[4] That

[1] Gore, *Church and Ministry*, pp. 58-61. [2] Note on Anglican Orders, p. 263*f*.
[3] Headlam, Bampton Lectures, pp. 131, 261.
[4] *De Unitate* 5: Episcopatus unus est, cuius a singulis in solidum pars tenetur.

is to say the episcopal acts of a bishop are acts of the episcopate καθ' ὅλον, not because of the concurrence of his colleagues, but because each exercises in his own jurisdiction the plenitude of episcopacy, just as a state official exercises the whole imperium. Moreover, Cyprian also shows that the bishop's act is linked not only with the totality of the episcopate but with the collective unity of his own diocese, consisting of bishop, other clergy, and laity, who together form an organic member of the whole Church.[1] It is proper to conclude that the diocese is as necessary to the bishop as the bishop is to the diocese: together they constitute an organ of the activity of our Lord as primary minister of the sacrament of Holy Order.

It would therefore appear that, of the two views outlined above, each contributes an important element in the theory of the Ministry, and neither should be exclusive of the other. We may not suppose that the episcopate can act independently of its constitutional position in the body, nor that the body can ignore the continuity and solidarity of the episcopate. Whatever is permitted in South India should give recognition to both factors and not to one only. It needs to be emphasized that the process which the Church uses in the consecration of a bishop not only always has involved, and always will involve, a succession from one to another, but also secures something equally important —namely, that the consecration shall be demonstrably the act of the body corporately. The Council of Nicæa laid down that consecration should be by all the bishops of the province, or if that be impossible by three at the least. The provision of three consecrators was not due to any special virtue in the number three, nor is it an insurance against a flaw in the pedigree of any of them, but to secure beyond doubt that the action is performed, through those who have authority to call and send, by the whole Church. There are to be as many consecrators as possible, primarily of the same province. Participation by representative bishops from other provinces, where it is possible, testifies to the wider unity of many provinces in the One Church, but a heterogeneous trio of bishops acting without jurisdiction are committing an act of schism. Nor can a bishop admit to the priesthood unless he occupies a See or is commissioned by the occupant of a See. Can we properly profess to commission bishops to ordain apart from the consent and participation of the faithful of their own diocese? For the succession is the perpetual succession of a corporation, rather than a piece of personal property in a bishop's own disposition.

We may well ask whether the formula "restricted intercommunion" does not cast a doubt upon the regularity if not the validity of the acts of the community in separation, a doubt which will remain to be resolved later. If we repudiate the dioceses of South India we destroy the essential jurisdiction to confer Holy Orders and we reduce their bishops to the status of episcopi vagantes. They would be something and nothing. It would therefore be difficult to complain if a large body of opinion among ourselves, or Churches with whom we are, or may be, in communion, were to demand that ministers ordained in the Church

[1] Ep. xxxiii. 1: Quando ecclesia in episcopo et clero et in omnibus stantibus sit constituta.

of South India be required to be ordained *sub conditione* before being admitted as priests elsewhere. The position cannot be satisfactory unless and until the four dioceses, and others which might be constituted in association with them, are recognizable without diplomatic evasion as an integral and organic province of the Great Church. And we must not do anything now which we shall have to undo or repudiate later. We need to reverse the terms of the proposal as it stands, so that as dioceses they shall be in full communion, although within their own fellowship they may include many who are personally out of communion with us—*viz.*, those members who have not received in their own persons episcopal consecration, ordination or confirmation. The bishop stands or falls by the community over which he exercises oversight. We cannot acknowledge the bishop minus community. We cannot repudiate the community without repudiating its common acts and depriving them of acknowledgment "by every part of the Church as possessing . . . the authority of the whole body." And this is just what it is essential to secure demonstrably and without doubt in South India.

H. Bryant Salmon.

Theological College,
Wells.

Some Thoughts upon the Sacramental

St Paul speaks of the Colossian Christians as "raised together with" Christ (Col. iii, 1), using the verb συνεγείρω—not the verb συνανίστημι—and the aorist tense. He does not speak of them as having put away unrighteousness or as having done anything at all themselves. He speaks of an objective fact complete in itself. Something happened to them which was quite independent of their subjective state, but which carried with it a moral obligation by which, if they responded to it, their subjective state would be entirely changed. He is referring to their Baptism, in which they were "raised together with" Christ (Col. ii, 12), as constituting a resurrection by no means identical with what Matthew Arnold (*St Paul and Protestantism*, ed. 1887, p. 57) so regarded. St Paul does not say that a man is risen provided that he is a good man, whereas otherwise he is not risen. Nevertheless the immediate subjective reaction to this wholly objective fact he declared to be quite imperative.

There has always been a tendency to make it appear that our Lord's protest against the unreality of His day was a declaration in favour of the abolition of the objective in religion. The facts are quite otherwise. Those formalists were making a god of their θρησκεία, that is to say, of their own subjective religious observance, worshipping it rather than the one great Objective, God Himself. However, at times like the present, when efforts are rightly made to bring Christians together in a unity of faith and practice, there is strong temptation to lighten the ship of cargo, which is very far from being lumber. The temptation to depreciate what is *spiritually* objective is very insidious.

It is contended that the memory of Christ is something wholly

subjective and that it constitutes an unfailing and sufficient stimulus to moral effort. Why then, it is questioned, insist upon something objective with particular definite conditions and with a history of its own? Why claim that Baptism is *in itself* a new birth, that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is *in itself* the Body and Blood of Christ? And, even granting that these are in themselves what is contended, *how* do they affect the will at all differently from the grateful memory of Christ and of His work?

We may have our *Ecclesia locuta est* and think the question closed. It will not do. There remains unsolved the inevitable problem of the reasonableness of what ecclesiastical authority propounds. What can we say? We do not want to score a point, to gain over an opponent, but to do the levelling up and the levelling down for Christ.

To begin with we may readily allow that the subjective memory of Christ is undoubtedly a stimulus to moral effort. But no less confidently shall we maintain that to teach the objectivity of the sacramental does not tend to relax moral effort, nor does it in the least degree dispense with what is subjective in the recipient. The very terms "objective" and "subjective" imply correlation. St Paul is clear on this point: "Seek the things that are above. . . . Set your mind on the things that are above." However indolent human nature may be, and however easy it may be for it to rest idly upon accomplished objective facts, it cannot be said that St Paul contemplates the objective fact of Baptism as calculated to foster an unhealthy repose. And indeed we may observe that *generally*—by no means only in the sphere of religion—the subjective element, taken by itself, is far more dangerous than is the objective, leading as it does to pure individualism, breaking down social life and dethroning ideals held in common. It opens floodgates of devastation.

In these days we have been shocked into seriousness, and there is the less danger of our treating the sacramental lightly as of indifferent import. We have recovered something of the tremendous earnestness of Charles Simeon, of John Henry Newman, of Frederick Denison Maurice. It was once remarked to the present writer by a zealous parish priest that he had found the great stumbling block in the way of the average man to be a profound disbelief, not so much in miracles and the like, as in the sacramental as an objective reality. The sound corrective consists in an unqualified urge to provide this objective reality with its proper subjective complement—namely, moral effort—yet without allowing it to be forgotten that the subjective complement, however necessary, can never take the place of the objective reality, that these two inseparable elements make the whole as do the concave and convex of a lens. And so the Christian life is lived. God originates: man corresponds.

† Watkin Williams.

Malvern.

CORRESPONDENCE

"NO OTHER GOSPEL"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

It was with very warm appreciation that I read Pastor Ehrenberg's review of *No Other Gospel* and *The Significance of the Barmen Declaration* in your June number, for his was the first review that I had seen to take *No Other Gospel* in particular with the seriousness with which it was intended. On one point, however, he does misunderstand my purpose. He states that I am "profoundly worried by the negative condemnations which accompany its [Barmen's] testimonies." When reading my paper at the Conference held in Newnham College, I was faced by a challenge—to say in the name of Anglicanism whether or no we Anglicans could accept the Barmen Declaration. My answer was "Yes" and "No"—"Yes" to Barmen where it affirmed the Gospel, "Yes" to Barmen where it brought forward the "No" that the Church of recent years has hesitated to utter but that is in the line of all the great anathemas, but "No" to the "No" of Barmen at least as interpreted by Pastor Asmussen (and it was Pastor Asmussen's interpretation that Pastor Kramm emphasized). The Church of England will have to learn to say "No," but that "No" when it is uttered will be in the line of her traditional theology, and consequently nearer to the "No" of *Mit brennender Sorge* than to the "No" of the Barmen Declaration. If I was worried at the Conference in Newnham it was only over a "No" that in condemning the "German Christians" appeared to impinge on the Christian doctrine of Creation also. But that I was serious over the need for Anglicans to face the necessity of saying "No" is witnessed by the fact that the discussion with Lutheran theologians at Newnham was promptly followed by the course of sermons in St Bene't's now published under the title *No Other Gospel*.

Yours truly,

J. O. COBHAM, C.F.

As from 4, MAITLAND HOUSE,
BARTON ROAD,
CAMBRIDGE.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL MONARCH

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

May I take exception to a sentence in Mr McDermott's highly interesting and important letter which appeared in the June issue of THEOLOGY? He says: "the modern constitutional monarch, who reigns but does not govern, is a juridical entity entirely different from the anointed monarch of the past." Surely not! He is still "by divine and not human" election—in that he is born to the throne and not elected to it; and he is still crowned and anointed at a Christian service. Moreover, so long as he theoretically retains the royal prerogatives (even if he never exercises them) he rules as King—his own personal wisdom being the decisive factor in his refusal to gainsay the wishes of

his Parliament—not anything inhering in the Constitution. Indeed, if it be true (as some say) that the King has "but the shadow of his former power" in this country, it will be seen throughout history that it has always been the King in the last resort who has reduced that power. The only exceptions were the sovereigns who reigned from William III to George II—when the lawful Kings of England were in exile. Mr McDermott's vision of England as a "crowned republic" is, I suggest, as theoretically untrue as the fact itself would be theologically unsound.

Ashley Sampson.

31, Harrington Gardens, S.W.7.

Mr McDermott writes:

It would take too much space if I were to attempt a refutation of what I must regard as Mr Sampson's theologico-political unrealism. Whatever the strict legal theory may be, it is surely the constitutional practice that the Sovereign reigns but does not govern and always acts on the advice of Ministers who command a majority in the House of Commons, and in fact the throne is held by a Parliamentary title in virtue of the Glorious Revolution of 1688 and the Act of Settlement. And unless on the principles of very rigorous Jacobitism, a creed surely rather unrealistic to-day if it exists at all, what theological objection can there be to a "crowned republic" or to any *de facto* government actually in possession and administering justice?

CONFESSIONAL THEOLOGY AND THE ANGLICAN CHURCH

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

Although Mr Cant and Mr McDermott have already commented admirably upon the somewhat national and "denominational" flavour of Mr Jacques' presentation of Anglicanism, I still think more might be made of that which is fundamental to Anglican theology, distinguishing it sharply from the theology of the Protestant confessions—*viz.*, the appeal to catholic antiquity. The Convocation of 1571, which ratified the XXXIX Articles, directed preachers to adhere to the interpretation of Scripture given by "the catholic fathers and ancient bishops"; the Homilies uphold as the standard of orthodoxy what was "believed and taught of the old holy fathers, and most ancient learned doctors, and received in the old primitive Church, which was most uncorrupt and pure"; and Hooker concludes his confutation of certain Romish doctrines by saying, "These opinions have youth in their countenance; antiquity knew them not." All through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the professed intention of the Church of England was to counter the innovations of Rome and Geneva by rediscovering the faith of the undivided Church.

Now this intention is the most important feature of the Anglican tradition—far more important than actual theological achievements. Because of it, we are not committed to any errors the Reformers may have made. If at some points they mistook the doctrine of "the

catholic fathers and ancient bishops," even as they seem to have mistaken the character of primitive liturgy, it is of no very great consequence; for we are at liberty to appeal from them, without disloyalty to the Church of England, to the fathers themselves. In short, in "controversies of faith" the final court of appeal for Anglicans is not the writings of Anglican divines, nor even the XXXIX Articles of the Church of England, but the tradition of the undivided Church.

This point was well brought out in a controversy between Pusey and Hook in 1846. To quote Liddon's account of it: "If the Church of England appealed to antiquity, so Pusey argued, she meant antiquity to be studied and followed by her children; Hook maintained that the ideas of the Reformers about antiquity were practically final, and that to differ from them was disloyal to the Church of England. Thus they read the ancients with different eyes: Pusey desired to know exactly what they meant and to follow it; Hook was willing to agree with the Fathers so far as they were in agreement with the Reformers of the sixteenth century." Thus Hook "could not agree with Pusey in thinking that we can go to the old Catholic doctors to *judge* the Church of England," whereas the latter held there were subjects, "such as prayers for the faithful departed or the Eucharistic Sacrifice, as to which the English Church does not speak with the clearness of primitive antiquity." There can be no doubt that Pusey was in the right; for, unless the appeal to antiquity is understood as he understood it, it becomes merely a convenient club with which to beat Rome and the Protestants.

This being so, Anglicanism ought not to be represented as "Hookerism"; for Hooker is not for Anglicans what Luther is for Lutherans and Calvin for Calvinists. Luther and Calvin have authority with their disciples as the "founders" of theological traditions; Hooker has authority with us in so far as he succeeded in recovering the doctrine of the catholic fathers. And Anglicanism remains true to itself in so far as it rejects all that is local and particular and professes what was anciently believed *ubique et ab omnibus*.

It remains to be said that, although Mr Jacques seems to have ignored this vital difference between Anglicanism and the confessional theologies, his main point is not thereby affected. It is undeniable that many Anglicans are far too apt to neglect the fathers—their proper study—and clutch avidly and uncritically at extraneous systems. In order to check this tendency, the development of a theology that is genuinely Anglican and patristic is much to be wished.

Perhaps I may be allowed to add, by way of postscript, a comment upon another question raised by Mr Jacques and subsequent correspondents. It is true that Hooker's treatment of the relation between Church and State is of little value to us to-day; but Herbert Thorndike, who had experience of a puritan government antagonistic to the Church, has a theology of the subject that is more realistic, more relevant to our situation and worthy of our closest attention.

Yours faithfully,

G. B. Bentley.

4, Vicars' Court,
Lincoln.
June 19, 1944.

BOOK REVIEWS

FRANCIS CARDINAL BOURNE. By Ernest Oldmeadow. Volume II. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 18s.

Mr Ernest Oldmeadow's second volume portraying the life of the late Cardinal Bourne contains some 414 pages of material relating to the last twenty-five years. The Cardinal was an extremely able administrator and by no means lacking characteristics that are associated with statesmanship. With striking tenacity and singleness of mind he devoted all his energy and ability to enhancing the prestige of the great Communion of which he was so distinguished a chief pastor. It may be affirmed that the prestige which the English Roman Communion achieved in the last thirty years was mainly due to his tireless effort and skilful administration. He never let pass any opportunity of advancing Roman claims, authority and prestige, and was thus upon more than one occasion involved in sharp controversy, but he remained personally untouched by any bitterness and entirely sincere. Those who had personal contact with him could but feel this and were also impressed by his real charity, goodness and by no means narrow outlook or disposition. That he was often misunderstood not only by those outside as well as by his co-religionists, especially the Irish, adds something of pathos to the story of his labours for peace. No one could have been more English in outlook and ideals, and this trait was not merely assumed for politic reasons. He was never backward where a chance of serving his country presented itself, as the testimony of several well-known officials and statesmen proves. The esteem in which he was held in official circles sprang from the fact "you always know where you are with Bourne." It is impossible to follow here the varied and interesting record of his life and work, in Spain, Portugal, Germany, Italy, America and the Near East, in the affair of the Belgian Congo, during the Four Years War, in Conclave, in dealing with the unhappy Casement, as Papal Legate. In the matter of the General Strike it is clearly proved that the accusation of breaking pact with the late Dr Randall Davidson, with whom he remained always on excellent terms, is false. Other interesting chapters deal with "Action Française," the "Centenary of Emancipation," and the cause of the English Martyrs, to which he gave lifelong devotion and interest. His views on education deserve close attention and forestall the recent Education Bill. Likewise his system for training clergy merits study. The cherished plan for division of dioceses as well as the provision of fresh ones would now seem fully justified. From it emerges the marked independence of his episcopal brethren. That the Cardinal did not find it always easy to commend his extensive plans to them is not surprising in view of the history of the Roman diocesan system in England. In matters of this kind, as with the question of Royal Declaration at the Coronation until its modification, he displayed skill and patience. Of the York controversy it may at least be said that it is difficult to see what other line he could have taken. The other side of the matter has been expressed by Dr Henson in his *Retrospect*. Despite a plain and unadorned

delivery, he was impressive in the pulpit. Two very remarkable sermons of his recur to the mind, one upon the text Acts iv, 12, and the other upon the significance of "the House of God" preached at the completion of a church in his own much loved Hertfordshire. He improved the position of the Archbishopric which he graced and this "he did mainly by his straightforward frankness and clear distinction between matters of principle and matters open to discussion."

Mr Oldmeadow's chapter dealing with Malines makes painful reading. It is not his candour which is at fault. We wonder, however, whether his estimate of the late Lord Halifax is really not a little influenced by his strong views with regard to Anglican claims. Lord Halifax's impetuosity may be granted, but to attribute his ideal to an unconscious obsession termed "Englishry" and a consequent emphasis upon "Recognition" rather than "Reunion" appears a little far-fetched. The difficulties connected with the Conversations are fully dealt with. Dr Davidson saw clearly the existence of "a great mountain." Lord Halifax and Abbé Portal had little hope of encouragement at Westminster, and could it be otherwise? This is no reflection upon the Cardinal. Newman once said to Lord Halifax, "If ever you hope to do anything by way of Reunion look to France." Again we are not sure that the ideals of Lord Halifax can be dismissed under the heading of Portalism. Something has come out of the Conversations even if only a more thorough understanding of Anglicanism abroad—a fact admitted by Mr Oldmeadow. The chapter should be carefully read and compared with other published accounts and documents concerning the Conversations. The time is not yet ripe for the passing of a conclusive verdict. Mr Oldmeadow has given us not only an admirable picture of the Cardinal but a useful and valuable insight into the crowded pages of what is rapidly becoming past history.

IVAN R. YOUNG.

KENSWORTH.

WHAT THE CROSS MEANS TO ME. A Theological Symposium. James Clarke and Co. 7s. 6d.

It may justly be doubted whether the doctrine of the Atonement can usefully be handled in a short essay. If the writer confines himself to one aspect of his subject, he may be taken to task for his omissions; if he tries to cover the whole ground, the treatment may be slight; and if, like Mr Middleton Murry, he takes the title too much to heart, and writes in a subjective fashion, he may be unintelligible to those who have not shared his experience. These risks of brevity might have been less if the authors had shared a common theological tradition; but they do not: they are all over the place, and it is not easy to sort them out.

The modernist view which fastens on the moral effectiveness of the Cross and shies at the sacrifice is well represented. Its strength and its weakness are clearly exposed in the essays of Dr Cadoux and Dr Major. If it appears incomplete in view of the doctrine in the Book of Common Prayer, which speaks plainly of the "full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world," yet it is

clearly and intelligibly presented in these essays, and deserves to be well considered, and to be supplemented rather than cast aside.

The attraction of this view lies partly in its concern with sanctification, the neglect of which mars much recent theological work, which seeks, and rightly seeks, in the Reformation tradition something more satisfying than contemporary modernism. The third essay in this symposium, for example—an essay so written as to make the signature of D. R. Davies almost superfluous—is a most forceful presentation of the Cross as a "revelation of man's sin, and of the contradiction which it involves in history." Within these limits it is admirable. But what of the life which flows from the Cross, the water and blood there shed which are the ground of the sacraments?

In the thirteenth essay, Fr Victor White has written an introduction to St Thomas's teaching on the Atonement. In this way he is able to indicate a fuller and more satisfying treatment than is found elsewhere in the book. The footnotes should provide a useful guide to the relevant passages of the *Summa*, and the essay is itself an incentive to the study of Aquinas.

A. C. Scupholme.

Ugthorpe Vicarage,
Whitby.

The Trumpet Shall Sound. By Joseph McCulloch. Michael Joseph. 7s. 6d.

It would not be true to say that I am glad to handle another of Mr McCulloch's books. They have an awkward habit of making you feel extremely uncomfortable. But I think that it is a good thing that another book has come, and that it will be a good thing if it continues the heart-searching provoked by *We Have Our Orders*.

But it is a difficult book to review. It cannot properly be either summarized or criticized briefly. Mr McCulloch writes "out of the self-despair which many of us know in experience to be the only ground for grace." He takes stock of our plight to discover what "can and ought to be done to defeat the devil." We lack a sense of catastrophe, and "no man is reckless of self until he is desperate." And it is the desperate who, within the churches, alone are likely to set about building the new community. We must begin just at that point in the world where we are.

Then he addresses parsons, and bids us remember five things about our work. We are no holier than other members of the Church; our main job is not the performance of "recitations-in-course," but is friendship; we are to be bridge builders; and spokesmen (wherefore we must not talk but listen); and we must aim at the ideal of being "the wise man of the place."

"The clergy hold the key to the religious situation in England"; and their first job is to assemble a "community of persons who are meeting at the level of the life after the Spirit." This group will be experimental; its purpose will be the discovery of *Koinonia* in miniature. And that discovery will have its effect upon the worship and the work of a parish.

No one is likely to enjoy this book, but I hope that many people will read it.

H. C. L. Heywood.

Cambridge.

THE UNREST IN RELIGION. An Enquiry by a Member of the Church of England into the Present Position of the Church. By Erasmian. George Allen and Unwin. 6s.

The anonymous lay author of this short book has been stirred by the report on *Doctrine in the Church of England* (1938), and, in particular, by its reference to the need for "openmindedness on vital points of doctrine." He considers that "the main cause of the unrest in religion and the main obstacle to its revival to-day" is "the impossibility of continuing to affirm our blind belief in theories and assertions which we must admit to be largely founded in error." He therefore examines first our knowledge of Jesus, then the character and composition of the Gospels, and finally the place of the supernatural in Christianity with special reference to the creeds. He concludes that Jesus' "simple teaching" has been "overlaid by Christology"; that the gospels are "full of errors and conflicting statements," and therefore that "it is unwise to be positive about any point in early Christian history"; and, finally, that difficulties seriously felt by many about doctrines based on what seems to be inadequate evidence cannot be met by declarations that "our faith is a mystery settled for us."

Dignity and courtesy mark the pages of this book. It exhibits the fruit of much reading and thought. Burkitt, Bethune-Baker, Streeter, Rashdall, Inge, Loisy, Guignebert, Réville, Howard, Gore, Clodd, Dill, Montefiore, Kennedy, Darwell Stone and Vincent Taylor, have all been worked through. But I think its usefulness will be mainly confined to those whose age, temperament, education, and problems most nearly resemble those of its author. For professional theologians it is too slight. For the great mass of Christians it is probably too technical. But many of the author's coevals may well thank him for helping them to see more clearly the nature of their own inquiries, and that is always a step in the right direction.

H. C. L. HEYWOOD.

CAMBRIDGE.

SHORTER NOTICES

Men and Moral Principles. By L. Susan Stebbing. Humphrey Milford. 2s.

This L. T. Hobhouse Memorial Lecture was delivered at Cambridge in 1943. It carefully analyses the scientific method of abstracting from a given total situation only such data as are relevant to the particular science. The limitations of this method in ethics are apparent, for in ethics the *total* situation must be taken into account. In the second half of her lecture, Prof. Stebbing gives brief examples of how the moral philosopher ought rightly to proceed, but here she is meagre and disappointing.

The Destiny of Man. By R. H. Ward. Adelphi Players. 2s.

A dramatized argument on Christian anthropology which might well be called "The Book of Job in Modern Dress." It is too abstruse and has insufficient action for popular or parochial use.

Plans for World Peace. By Sylvester John Hamilton. University of Chicago Press. n.p.

An account of the principal plans for preventing war and organizing peace from Pierre Dubois (1305) till the end of the Great War in 1918. The book is well documented and quite readable. The author hopes that chronicling past failures will help planning in the future. But his sudden and unprepared-for assertion in the last chapter that all these plans failed owing to the abandonment of "natural law" (the meaning of which he does not define) seems a *tour de force* of the kind an undergraduate puts at the end of his essay, and not very helpful for future planning.

Concerning the Priestly Life. By Raymond Raynes, C.R. Dacre Press. 1s. 6d.

This booklet says little that has not been said before but much that is specially valuable to the young priest who is tempted to plunge himself into much "busyness" which is alien to the task for which he was ordained. Fr Raynes reasserts the primacy of prayer in a priest's life and gives many practical hints and suggestions, some of which (*e.g.*, that the daily offices should be said kneeling before the Reserved Sacrament) are hardly in accord with either the letter or the spirit of the Book of Common Prayer.

Anglican and Free Church Ministries. By G. W. Broomfield. S.P.C.K. 6d.

The present situation in the ecumenical movement is hardly favourable to this well-intentioned scheme for uniting the ministries of the Church of England and the Free Churches by mutual supplementary ordination as a first step to corporate reunion. For at the moment the denominations are largely concerned with the rediscovery of their own confessions and confessional theology. This is sharpening their consciousness of their own distinctive witness over against one another. There is, however, no desire to boycott the ecumenical movement, and as the theologians work back through their confessions to their common source in the Bible a new unity, we hope, may emerge. And then Canon Broomfield's scheme would enter the field of practical politics. Pigeon-hole it for the moment and get it down later for microscopic examination!

R. H. Fuller.

Ashbourne.

Note.—In September we shall publish some of the communications that have been received concerning Mr Bennett's article on "Our Struggle" and Fr Jarrett-Kerr's on "Real Life is Being."—Ed.

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher